

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated December 4, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 10-15 are rejected by the Examiner.

With this response, claims 11, 13 and 15 have been amended, and claim 12 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new material has been added.

Accordingly, claims 10, 11 and 13-15 are currently pending in this application with claims 1-9 having been withdrawn in response to the Examiner's requirement for restriction. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The rejection to claims 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. 112 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 11, 13 and 15 have been amended to include, for example, "forming a first plurality of seal patterns along outer edges of a first plurality of image display parts by using the syringes". Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 11, 13 and 15 fully comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112 and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Further, claim 12 is canceled, so its rejection is now moot.

On pages 3-7 of the Office Action, claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Publication No. 2001/0013920 (hereinafter "Hashimoto"), in view of United States Patent No. 5,292,368 (hereinafter "Komine"), Japanese Patent No. 11-014953 (hereinafter "Iwane"), and Japanese Patent No. 2001-356353 (hereinafter "Hachiman"). Claims 10-12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hashimoto in view of Komine, Iwane and Hachiman as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Japanese Patent No. 2001-356353 (hereinafter “Hachiman”). Moreover, claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Komine, Iwane, and Hachiman as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Japanese Patent No. 61-055625 (hereinafter “Yamamoto”).

Claim 11 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 11 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “mounting first, second and third pluralities of syringes each having a nozzle at one end portion at first, second and third pluralities of robot arms arranged at opposing sides of first, second and third tables, respectively, at least two robot arms arranged at each opposing side of the first, second and third tables, wherein the first, second and third pluralities of robot arms convey the first, second and third pluralities of syringes to desired positions on the first, second and third tables; loading a substrate having a plurality of image display parts onto the first table; forming a first plurality of seal patterns along outer edges of a first plurality of image display parts by using the first plurality of syringes; loading the substrate having the first plurality of seal patterns onto the second table; forming a second plurality of seal patterns along outer edges of a second plurality of image display parts by using the second plurality of syringes; loading the substrate having the first and second plurality of seal patterns onto the third table; forming a third plurality of seal patterns along outer edges of a third plurality of image display parts by using the third plurality of syringes; and independently driving the first, second and third tables along a convey path of supplying a dispensing material through the nozzles onto the substrate.”. None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggestions at least the aforementioned features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 and claim 10, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 13 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 13 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “mounting first and second pluralities of syringes each having a nozzle at one end portion at first and second pluralities of robot arms arranged at opposing sides of first and second tables, respectively, at least two robot arms arranged at each opposing side of the first and second tables; loading a substrate having a first plurality of image display parts and a second plurality of image display parts onto the first table, wherein the first

plurality of image display parts have a first size and the second plurality of image display parts have a second size; forming a plurality of first seal patterns along outer edges of the first image display parts by using the first plurality of syringes; loading the substrate having the first plurality of seal patterns onto the second table; forming a second plurality of seal patterns along outer edges of the second plurality of image display parts by using the second plurality of syringes; and independently driving the first and second tables along a convey path of the substrate.”. None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggestions at least the aforementioned feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 and claim 14, which depends from claim 13, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 15 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 15 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “mounting first, second, and third pluralities of syringes each having a nozzle at one end portion at first, second, and third pluralities of robot arms arranged at opposing sides of first, second, and third tables, at least two robot arms arranged at each opposing side of the first, second and third tables; loading a substrate having a plurality of image display parts onto the first table; forming a plurality of seal patterns along outer edges of the image display parts using the first plurality of syringes; loading the substrate having the plurality of seal patterns onto the second table; dropping liquid crystal material onto the image display parts using the second plurality of syringes; loading the substrate having liquid crystal material onto the third table; forming a plurality of silver dots at the outer edges of the image display parts using the third plurality of syringes; and independently driving the first, second and third tables along a convey path of the substrate.”. None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggestions at least the aforementioned feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is allowable over the cited references.

Moreover, as described above, the first, second, and third pluralities of robot arms of the present invention convey the first, second, and third pluralities of syringes to desired positions on the first to third tables. Thus, even if an area of the first, second, and third pluralities of image display parts may change as an area of the substrate increases or as the liquid crystal display panel changes, the first, second, and third pluralities of robot arms may easily

accommodate the changes. Therefore, reconfiguration of the dispensing system may not be necessary, thereby increasing productivity and efficiency.

On pages 7-8 of the Office Action, claims 10-15 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16-25 of co-pending Application No. 10/825,362 in view of Komine, and Japanese Patent No. 2001-330840 (hereinafter "Ogino").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 10-15 and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 10-15 are provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16-15 of co-pending Application No. 10/825,362 in view of Komine and Ogino. Upon the indication of allowable subject matter in co-pending Application No. 10/825,362, Applicants will then consider filing of a terminal disclaimer.


Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: **4 March 2008**

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Eric J. Nuss
Registration No.: 40,106
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant